UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,769	03/20/2001	Michael Scheetz	10006053-1	8879

7590 08/04/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
ALI, SYED J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2127	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/812,769	SCHEETZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Syed J Ali	2127	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 March 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 March 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *March 20, 2001*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. **Claims 6, 9, and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities:**

a. In lines 2-3 of claim 6, one instance of "remote method invocation" should be deleted.

b. In line 5 of claim 9, "an remote method invocation process" should read "a remote method invocation process".

c. In lines 1 and 10 of claim 15, "an remote method invocation process" should read "a remote method invocation process".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kekic et al. (USPN 6,664,978) (hereinafter Kekic) in view of Slaughter et al. (USPN 6,643,650) (hereinafter Slaughter).**

5. As per claim 1, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of binding processes in a network system, the method comprising:

binding a parent process with a remote method invocation process (col. 20 line 56 - col. 21 line 17; col. 58 line 64 - col. 59 line 16); and

calling an object associated with the parent process (col. 7 lines 11-19; col. 17 lines 35-54), the object initiating a thread to perform the steps of:

monitoring the status of remote method invocation processes (col. 7 lines 11-19; col. 17 lines 35-54; col. 82 line 49 - col. 83 line 28).

6. Slaughter teaches the invention as claimed, including the following limitations not shown by Kekic:

rebinding the parent process with an active remote method invocation process when the thread determines that its parent process is not bound with an active remote method invocation process (col. 3 lines 6-15; col. 26 line 61 - col. 27 line 2; col. 30 lines 23-49).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kekic and Slaughter since the method of Kekic, while implementing a way of binding a remote method invocation process with a management process, fails to explicitly account for the distributed object mechanism. Specifically, as a process is moved across a network, the process may become unbound from the parent process as the process moves through the protocol stack. Slaughter accounts for this by allowing an RMI process to be unbound and rebound as the process moves across the network, thereby allowing greater mobility across a distributed network.

8. As per claim 2, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, wherein the binding step comprises:

providing a network address of the parent process to the active remote method invocation process (col. 42 lines 46-55).

9. As per claim 3, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, wherein the binding step comprises:

performing a list call to an active remote method invocation process to determine whether the parent process is bound to an active remote method invocation process (col. 58 line 64 - col. 59 line 16).

10. As per claim 4, Slaughter teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 3, wherein the rebinding step comprises:

performing a rebind call to an active remote method invocation process (col. 3 lines 6-15; col. 26 line 61 - col. 27 line 2; col. 30 lines 23-49).

11. As per claim 5, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, wherein the monitoring step comprises:

calling an active remote method invocation process to determine whether the parent process network address is registered with an active remote method invocation process (col. 82 line 49 - col. 83 line 28; col. 83 line 59 - col. 84 line 15).

12. As per claim 6, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, comprising:

binding a second parent process with a remote method invocation process (col. 20 line 56 - col. 21 line 17; col. 58 line 64 - col. 59 line 16); and

calling a second object associated with the second parent process (col. 7 lines 11-19; col. 17 lines 35-54), the second object initiating a second thread to perform the steps of:

monitoring the status of remote method invocation processes (col. 7 lines 11-19; col. 17 lines 35-54; col. 82 line 49 - col. 83 line 28).

13. Slaughter teaches the invention as claimed, including the following limitations not shown by Kekic:

rebinding the second parent process with an active remote method invocation process when the second thread determines that the second parent process is not bound with an active remote method invocation process (col. 3 lines 6-15; col. 26 line 61 - col. 27 line 2; col. 30 lines 23-49).

14. As per claim 7, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, wherein the step of binding a parent process comprises:

binding one of an RMI daemon, a distributed task facility daemon, a log manager daemon, or a domain manager daemon, with an active RMI daemon (col. 82 lines 16-43).

15. As per claim 8, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 1, comprising:

terminating the thread when the parent process is terminated (col. 82 line 49 - col. 83 line 28; col. 83 lines 40-47; col. 83 line 59 - col. 84 line 15).

16. As per claim 9, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including a network system, comprising:

a plurality of remote nodes, at least one of the remote nodes running a remote method invocation process (col. 5 lines 8-15; col. 20 line 56 - col. 21 line 17; col. 58 line 64 - col. 59 line 16); and

a management server for managing the remote nodes, the management server including at least one processor for running a remote method invocation process (col. 5 lines 8-15; col. 20 line 56 - col. 21 line 17; col. 58 line 64 - col. 59 line 16) and at least one management process (col. 5 lines 8-15), each at least one management process being associated with an object capable of initiating a thread to perform the steps of:

monitoring the status of the of remote method invocation processes (col. 7 lines 11-19; col. 17 lines 35-54; col. 82 line 49 - col. 83 line 28).

17. Slaughter teaches the invention as claimed, including the following limitations not shown by Kekic:

rebinding the at least one management process with an active remote method invocation process when the thread determines that the at least one management process is not bound with an active remote method invocation process (col. 3 lines 6-15; col. 26 line 61 - col. 27 line 2; col. 30 lines 23-49).

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kekic and Slaughter for reasons discussed above in reference to paragraph 7.

19. As per claim 10, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the network system of claim 9, wherein the at least one management process comprises a plurality of management processes (col. 5 lines 8-15).

20. As per claim 11, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the network system of claim 9, wherein the plurality of management processes comprise:

a distributed task facility process (col. 72 lines 33-67);

a domain manager process (col. 25 lines 16-24); and

a log manager process (col. 19 line 66 - col. 20 line 14).

21. As per claim 12, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the network system of claim 9, wherein each of the remote nodes runs a service control manager agent process for performing server management tasks (col. 5 lines 8-15; col. 20 line 56 - col. 21 line 17; col. 58 line 64 - col. 59 line 16).

22. As per claim 13, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the network system of claim 9, wherein the management server comprises:

a secondary storage device (col. 16 lines 1-30), the secondary storage device comprising:

a data repository (col. 16 lines 1-30);

a depot (col. 16 lines 1-30); and

a web server (col. 16 lines 1-30).

23. As per claim 14, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the network system of claim 9, wherein the plurality of remote nodes are arranged into at least one node group (col. 2 line 61 - col. 3 line 10), the network system comprising a service control manager for managing the at least one node group (col. 2 line 61 - col. 3 line 10; col. 5 lines 8-15; col. 20 line 56 - col. 21 line 17; col. 58 line 64 - col. 59 line 16).

24. As per claim 15, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of binding a parent process to a remote method invocation process, the method comprising:

b) performing an initialization call to an object associated with the parent process, the initialization call initiating a thread (col. 7 lines 11-19; col. 17 lines 35-54), the thread performing the steps of:

1) performing a list call to an active remote method invocation process to determine whether the parent process is bound with the active remote method invocation process (col. 58 line 64 - col. 59 line 16); and

3) repeating step 1 (col. 7 lines 11-19; col. 17 lines 35-54; col. 82 line 49 - col. 83 line 28).

25. Slaughter teaches the invention as claimed, including the following limitations not shown by Kekic:

a) performing a rebind call to a remote method invocation process to provide a network address and an object interface of a parent process to the remote method invocation process (col. 3 lines 6-15; col. 26 line 61 - col. 27 line 2; col. 30 lines 23-49); and

2) performing a rebind call to an active remote method invocation process if the thread determines that the parent process is not bound with an active remote method invocation process (col. 3 lines 6-15; col. 26 line 61 - col. 27 line 2; col. 30 lines 23-49); and

3) repeating step 2 (col. 26 line 61 - col. 27 line 2).

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kekic and Slaughter for reasons discussed above in reference to paragraph 7.

27. As per claim 16, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 15, wherein the parent process is one of a remote method invocation daemon, a distributed task facility daemon, a log manager daemon, and a domain manager daemon (col. 82 lines 16-43).

28. As per claim 17, Slaughter teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 15, wherein the step of performing a rebind call includes the step of performing a rebind call to a remote method invocation daemon (col. 3 lines 6-15; col. 26 line 61 - col. 27 line 2; col. 30 lines 23-49).

29. As per claim 18, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 15, wherein the step of performing a list call includes the step of performing a list call to a remote method invocation daemon (col. 58 line 64 - col. 59 line 16; col. 82 lines 16-43).

30. As per claim 19, Kekic teaches the invention as claimed, including the method of claim 15, comprising:

terminating the thread when the parent process is terminated (col. 82 line 49 - col. 83 line 28; col. 83 lines 40-47; col. 83 line 59 - col. 84 line 15).

Conclusion

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed J Ali whose telephone number is (703) 305-8106. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5:30, 2nd Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai T An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Syed Ali
July 15, 2001

LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER